



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/433,188	10/25/1999	DAVID FEINLEIB	MSI-311US	2227

22801 7590 12/18/2003

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, THU HA T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

13

DATE MAILED: 12/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PR4

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/433,188

Applicant(s)

FEINLEIB ET AL.

Examiner

Thu Ha T. Nguyen

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 October 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) 19 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 20-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-42 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on October 14, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:

3. Applicant argues that Traversat does not teach or suggest of collecting registration information for manufactures of components of a client computer. In response to Applicant's argument, Examiner asserts that Traversat does teach the step of collecting registration information for manufactures of components of a client computer as shown in figures 3, 6a-c, col. 3 lines 23-col. 4 lines 6, col. 10 lines 29-col. 11 lines 11. Client provides user profile information to server when client establishes a connection with server, then the server namespace 303 contains, or the other words, collects registration information such as client profile, client computer types from client and stores in server persistent dataspace.

4. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a

reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

5. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Darago suggests collecting registration information at client computer and establishing communications with server to register information to modify the process of registration information for manufacturers of components of the client computer by Traversat. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Darago in view of Traversat because it would have an efficient communication system that client computer provides all the registration information software and hardware version to servers in order to make servers can communicate and provide appropriate and suitable information to client with different type of client's platform.

6. Applicant argues in the previous amendment (paper no. 10, May 01, 2003) that Darago in view of Traversat does not disclose or suggest establishing two connections to two registration servers via the same communication link. In response to Applicant's argument, Examiner asserts that the step of suggest establishing two connections to two registration servers via the same communication link does not

Art Unit: 2155

clearly disclose in the claimed language as recited in the claimed invention as claimed. As recited in the claim: "...establishing a communication link between the client computer and a network... establishing a first connection, via the communication link... establishing a second connection, via the communication link..." In the claimed language, Applicant just broadly claimed the communication link. Examiner can interpret as the two connections could be established in the same or different communication link. Examiner does not reject the claims as a lack of antecedent basis under U.S.S. 112, 2nd paragraph, for indefiniteness because to Examiner, the claimed languages do not show the indefiniteness. However, Applicant leaves the claimed languages open as "...via the communication link..." thus, Examiner can interpret the two connections between client and server could be established in the same or another communication link.

7. Therefore, the examiner asserts that cited prior art teaches or suggests the subject matter broadly recited in independent claims 1, 8, 14, 23, 28-29. Claims 2-7, 9-13, 15-18, 20-22, 24-27 and 30-42 are also rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims and by other reasons set forth below. Accordingly, claims 1-18 and 20-42 are rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2155

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-18, 20-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Darago et al.**, U.S. Patent No. **6,282,573**, in view of **Traversat et al.**, U.S. Patent No. **6,161,125**.

10. As to claim 1, **Darago** teaches the invention as claimed, including one or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a computer program that, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform functions including:

collecting, registration information using one or more registration wizards at a client computer (figures 3-5, col. 3 lines 16-40, col. 10 lines 55-col. 11 lines 36, col. 15 lines 63-col. 16 lines 35);

establishing a communication link between the client computer and a network to establishing a first connection, via the communication link, to a first registration server of a plurality of registration servers (abstract, figures 3, 4, col. 6 lines 14-27, col. 6 lines 63-col. 7 lines 4, col. 9 lines 16-29, col. 16 lines 55-col. 17 lines 32);

communicating at least a first portion of the registration information to the first registration server via the first connection (abstract, figures 1, 3, 4, col. 6 lines 14-27,

col. 6 lines 63-col. 7 lines 4, col. 8 lines 13-col. 9 lines 29, col. 16 lines 55-col. 17 lines 32);

establishing a second connection, via the communication link, to a second registration server of the plurality of registration servers (figures 1, 3, 4, col. 6 lines 14-27, col. 6 lines 63-col. 7 lines 4, col. 8 lines 13-col. 9 lines 29, col. 16 lines 55-col. 17 lines 32); and

communicating at least a second portion of the registration information to the second registration server via the second connection (figures 1, 3, 4, col. 6 lines 14-27, col. 6 lines 63-col. 7 lines 4, col. 8 lines 13-col. 9 lines 29, col. 16 lines 55-col. 17 lines 32).

Darago does not explicitly teach registration information for manufacturers of components of the client computer. However, **Traversat** teaches the step of registration information for manufacturers of components of the client computer (figures 3, 6a-c, col. 3 lines 23-col. 4 lines 6, col. 10 lines 29-col. 11 lines 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Darago and Traversat** to have the step of registration information for manufacturers of components of the client computer because it would have an efficient communication system that client computer provides all the registration information software and hardware version to servers in order to make servers can communicate and provide appropriate and suitable information to client with different type of client's platform.

11. As to claim 2, **Darago** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the program further causes the one or more processors to perform functions including:

establishing additional connections to additional registration servers of the plurality of registration servers via the communication link (figures 1, 3, 4, col. 6 lines 14-27, col. 6 lines 63-col. 7 lines 4, col. 8 lines 13-col. 9 lines 29, col. 16 lines 55-col. 17 lines 32); and

communicating additional portions of the registration information to the additional registration servers (figures 1, 3, 4, col. 6 lines 14-27, col. 6 lines 63-col. 7 lines 4, col. 8 lines 13-col. 9 lines 29, col. 16 lines 55-col. 17 lines 32).

12. As to claim 3, **Darago** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the first portion and the second portion share at least some common information (col. 2 lines 61-col. 3 lines 14, col. 10 lines 20-52).

13. As to claim 4, **Darago** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the first portion and the second portion are identical (col. 2 lines 61-col. 3 lines 14, col. 10 lines 20-52).

14. As to claim 5, **Darago** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the registration information includes one or more of user demographic information and client computer information (figure 3, 4, col. 8 lines 50-64, col. 10 lines 55-col. 11 lines 10).

15. As to claim 6, **Darago** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the one or more registration wizards correspond to one or more software applications or hardware components (figures 2, 5, col. 16 lines 3-35).

16. As to claim 7, **Darago** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the establishing the first connection comprises establishing a first hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) connection, and wherein the establishing the second connection comprises establishing a second hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) connection (col. 1 lines 65-col. 2 lines 14, col. 12 lines 55-65).

17. As to claim 8, **Darago** teaches the invention as claimed, including a method comprising:

collecting, registration information using a registration wizard at a client computer (figures 3-5, col. 3 lines 16-40, col. 10 lines 55-col. 11 lines 36, col. 15 lines 63-col. 16 lines 35);

establishing a communication link between the client computer and a network (figures 3, 4, col. 6 lines 14-27, col. 6 lines 63-col. 7 lines 4, col. 9 lines 16-29, col. 16 lines 55-col. 17 lines 32);

establishing a plurality of connections, via the communication link, between the client computer and a plurality of registration databases (figures 1, 3, 4, col. 6 lines 14-27, col. 6 lines 63-col. 7 lines 4, col. 8 lines 13-col. 9 lines 29, col. 16 lines 55-col. 17 lines 32); and

communicating, for each of the plurality of connections, at least a portion of the registration information to one of the plurality of registration databases (figures 1, 3, 4, col. 6 lines 14-27, col. 6 lines 63-col. 7 lines 4, col. 8 lines 13-col. 9 lines 29, col. 16 lines 55-col. 17 lines 32).

Darago does not explicitly teach registration information for manufacturers of components of the client computer. However, **Traversat** teaches the step of registration information for manufacturers of components of the client computer (figures 3, 6a-c, col. 3 lines 23-col. 4 lines 6, col. 10 lines 29-col. 11 lines 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Darago** and **Traversat** to have the step of registration information for manufacturers of components of the client computer because it would have the same motivation as set forth in claim 1.

18. As to claim 9, **Darago** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the communicating comprises communicating, for each of the plurality of connections, a different portion of the registration information to the one of the plurality of registration databases (figures 1, 3, 4, col. 6 lines 14-27, col. 6 lines 63-col. 7 lines 4, col. 8 lines 13-col. 9 lines 29, col. 16 lines 55-col. 17 lines 32).

19. As to claim 10, **Darago** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the different portions share at least some common information (col. 2 lines 61-col. 3 lines 14, col. 10 lines 20-52).

20. As to claim 11, **Darago** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the registration information includes one or more of user demographic information and client computer information (figure 3, 4, col. 8 lines 50-64, col. 10 lines 55-col. 11 lines 10).

21. As to claim 12, **Darago** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the collecting comprises collecting the registration information for a plurality of software applications and hardware components (figures 2, 5, col. 16 lines 3-35).

22. As to claim 13, **Darago** teaches the invention as claimed, including one or more computer-readable memories containing a computer program that is executable by a processor to perform the method recited in claim 8 (figure 2, col. 9 lines 39-col. 10 lines 17).

23. As to claim 14, **Darago** teaches the invention as claimed, including a method comprising:

collecting, using a single registration wizard at a client computer, registration information for a plurality of registering components of the client computer (figures 3-5, col. 3 lines 16-40, col. 10 lines 55-col. 11 lines 36, col. 13 lines 35-61, col. 15 lines 63-col. 16 lines 35);

establishing a plurality of connections between the client computer and a plurality of registration databases corresponding to the plurality of registering components

(figures 1, 3, 4, col. 6 lines 14-27, col. 6 lines 63-col. 7 lines 4, col. 8 lines 13-col. 9 lines 29, col. 16 lines 55-col. 17 lines 32); and

transferring at least a portion of the registration information to each of the plurality of registration databases via the plurality of connections (figures 1, 3, 4, col. 6 lines 14-27, col. 6 lines 63-col. 7 lines 4, col. 8 lines 13-col. 9 lines 29, col. 16 lines 55-col. 17 lines 32).

Darago does not explicitly teach manufacturers of components of the client computer. However, **Traversat** teaches manufacturers of components of the client computer (figures 3, 6a-c, col. 3 lines 23-col. 4 lines 6, col. 10 lines 29-col. 11 lines 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Darago and Traversat** to have the step of registration information for manufacturers of components of the client computer because it would have the same motivation as set forth in claim 1.

24. As to claim 15, **Darago** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the plurality of registering components includes a software component and a hardware component (figures 2, 5, col. 16 lines 3-35).

25. As to claim 16, **Darago** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the hardware component comprises the client computer (figure 5, col. 15 lines 63-col. 16 lines 15).

26. As to claim 17, **Darago** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the plurality of registering components correspond on a one to one basis with the plurality of registration databases (col. 10 lines 55-col. 11 lines 36).

27. As to claim 18, **Darago** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the establishing a plurality of connections comprises:

establishing a communication link between the client computer and a network (figures 1, 3, 4, col. 6 lines 14-27, col. 6 lines 63-col. 7 lines 4, col. 8 lines 13-col. 9 lines 29, col. 16 lines 55-col. 17 lines 32); and

subsequently establishing connections between the client computer and each of the plurality of registration databases via the communication link (figures 1, 3, 4, col. 6 lines 14-27, col. 6 lines 63-col. 7 lines 4, col. 8 lines 13-col. 9 lines 29, col. 16 lines 55-col. 17 lines 32).

28. As to claim 20, **Darago** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the transferring comprises transferring different portions of the registration information to different ones of the plurality of registration databases (figures 1, 3, 4, col. 6 lines 14-27, col. 6 lines 63-col. 7 lines 4, col. 8 lines 13-col. 9 lines 29, col. 16 lines 55-col. 17 lines 32).

29. As to claim 21, **Darago** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the registration information includes one or more of user demographic information and client computer information (figure 3, 4, col. 8 lines 50-64, col. 10 lines 55-col. 11 lines 10).

30. As to claim 22, **Darago** teaches the invention as claimed, including one or more computer-readable memories containing a computer program that is executable by a processor to perform the method recited in claim 14 (figure 2, col. 9 lines 39-col. 10 lines 17).

31. As to claim 23, **Darago** teaches the invention as claimed, including a system comprising:

a registration wizard to collect registration information (figures 4, 5, col. 3 lines 16-40, col. 10 lines 55-col. 11 lines 36, col. 15 lines 63-col. 16 lines 35); and

one or more posting modules, coupled to the registration wizard to establish a plurality of connections between the client computer and to a plurality of registration databases corresponding to the plurality of manufacturers, and transfer at least a portion of the registration information to each of the plurality of registration databases via the plurality of connections (figures 1, 3, 4, col. 6 lines 14-27, col. 6 lines 63-col. 7 lines 4, col. 8 lines 13-col. 9 lines 29, col. 16 lines 55-col. 17 lines 32).

Darago does not explicitly teach registration information for manufacturers of plurality of components of the client computer. However, **Traversat** teaches the step of registration information for manufacturers of plurality of components of the client

Art Unit: 2155

computer (figures 3, 6a-c, col. 3 lines 23-col. 4 lines 6, col. 10 lines 29-col. 11 lines 11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Darago and Traversat** to have the step of registration information for manufacturers of components of the client computer because it would have the same motivation as set forth in claim 1.

32. As to claim 24, **Darago** does not explicitly teach the invention as claimed; however, **Traversat** teaches wherein the plurality of manufacturers include one or more of software application designers, hardware component manufacturers, and the system manufacturer (figures 2-4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Darago and Traversat** to have plurality of manufacturers include one or more of software application designers, hardware component manufacturers, and the system manufacturer because it would have an efficient communication system that client computer provides all the registration information software and hardware version to servers in order servers can provide suitable connection and information to client when establishing communication between client and server.

33. As to claim 25, **Darago** does not explicitly teach the invention as claimed; however, **Traversat** teaches wherein the plurality of manufacturers correspond on a one to one basis with the plurality of registration databases (abstract, figures 2-4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time

Art Unit: 2155

of the invention to combine the teachings of **Darago and Traversat** to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 24.

34. As to claim 26, **Darago** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the one or more posting modules are further to transfer different portions of the registration information to different ones of the plurality of registration databases (figures 1, 3, 4, col. 6 lines 14-27, col. 6 lines 63-col. 7 lines 4, col. 8 lines 13-col. 9 lines 29, col. 16 lines 55-col. 17 lines 32).

35. As to claim 27, **Darago** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the registration information includes one or more of user demographic information and client computer information (figure 3, 4, col. 8 lines 50-64, col. 10 lines 55-col. 11 lines 10).

36. As to claim 28, **Darago** teaches the invention as claimed, including a system comprising:

a plurality of server computers coupled to a network, each being coupled to at least one of a plurality of registration databases to store registration information received by the server computer (figures 1, 3-4, col. 6 lines 63-col. 7 lines 4, col. 8 lines 13-col. 9 lines 29); and

a client computer, coupled to the network, to collect registration information using a single user interface and to upload portions of the registration information to registration databases of the plurality of registration databases via a single

communication link (figures 3-5, col. 3 lines 16-40, col. 6 lines 14-col. 7 lines 4, col. 8 lines 13-col. 9 lines 29, col. 10 lines 55-col. 11 lines 36, col. 15 lines 63-col. 17 lines 32).

Darago does not explicitly teach registration information for manufacturers of components of the client computer. However, **Traversat** teaches the step of registration information for manufacturers of components of the client computer (figures 3, 6a-c, col. 3 lines 23-col. 4 lines 6, col. 10 lines 29-col. 11 lines 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Darago** and **Traversat** to have the step of registration information for manufacturers of components of the client computer because it would have the same motivation as set forth in claim 1.

37. As to claim 29, **Darago** teaches the invention as claimed, including an apparatus comprising:

- a bus (figure 1, element 116);
- a processor coupled to the bus (figure 1, elements 114);
- a network connection device coupled to the bus (figure 1); and
- a memory, coupled to the bus, to store a plurality of instructions that are executed by the processor, wherein the plurality of instructions, when executed, cause the processor to, collect registration information, initiate, using the network connection device, a communication link to a network, establish, via the communication link, a plurality of connections between the apparatus and a plurality of registration databases, and communicate, for each of the plurality of connections, at least a portion of the

registration information to one of the plurality of registration databases (figures 1-5, col. 9 lines 39-col. 10 lines 17, col. 10 lines 55-col. 11 lines 36, col. 15 lines 63-col. 16 lines 35).

Darago does not explicitly teach registration information for manufacturers of components of the apparatus. However, **Traversat** teaches the step of registration information for manufacturers of components of the apparatus (figures 3, 6a-c, col. 3 lines 23-col. 4 lines 6, col. 10 lines 29-col. 11 lines 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Darago and Traversat** to have the step of registration information for manufacturers of components of the client computer because it would have the same motivation as set forth in claim 1.

38. As to claim 30, **Darago** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the plurality of instructions that, when executed, cause the processor to collect registration information further cause the processor to collect one or more of user demographic information and client computer information (figure 3, 4, col. 8 lines 50-64, col. 10 lines 55-col. 11 lines 10).

39. As to claim 31, **Darago** does not explicitly teach the components comprise software components. However, **Traversat** teaches wherein the components comprise software components (figures 6a-c, col. 10 lines 29-col. 11 lines 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the

invention to combine the teachings of **Darago and Traversat** to have the components comprise software components because it would have the same motivation as set forth in claim 1.

40. As to claim 32, **Darago** does not explicitly teach the components comprise hardware components. However, **Traversat** teaches components comprise hardware components (figures 6a-c, col. 10 lines 29-col. 11 lines 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Darago and Traversat** to have the components comprise hardware components because it would have the same motivation as set forth in claim 1.

41. As to claim 33, **Darago** does not explicitly teach the components comprise both one or more hardware components and one or more software components. However, **Traversat** teaches wherein the components comprise both one or more hardware components and one or more software components (figures 3, 6a-c, col. 3 lines 23-col. 4 lines 6, col. 10 lines 29-col. 11 lines 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Darago and Traversat** to have the components comprise one or more hardware components and software components because it would have the same motivation as set forth in claim 1.

42. Claims 34-38 have the same limitation as claim 33; therefore, they are rejected under the same rational.

43. As to claim 39, **Darago** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the first registration server corresponds to a manufacture of an operating system executing on the client computer, and wherein the second registration server corresponds to a manufacture of the client computer (figures 1, 3, 4, col. 6 lines 14-27, col. 6 lines 63-col. 7 lines 4, col. 8 lines 13-col. 9 lines 29, col. 16 lines 55-col. 17 lines 32).

44. As to claim 40, **Darago** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein one of the plurality of registration databases corresponds to a manufacture of an operating system executing on the client computer, and wherein another of the plurality of registration databases corresponds to a manufacture of the client computer (figures 1, 3, 4, col. 6 lines 14-27, col. 6 lines 63-col. 7 lines 4, col. 8 lines 13-col. 9 lines 29, col. 16 lines 55-col. 17 lines 32).

45. As to claim 41, **Darago** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the collecting comprising accessing a plurality of registration documents to identify which registration information to collect (figure 3, 4, col. 8 lines 50-64, col. 10 lines 55-col. 11 lines 10).

46. Claim 42 has the same limitation as claim 41; therefore, they are rejected under the same rational.

Allowable Subject Matter

47. Claim 19 is allowed.

Conclusion

48. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

49. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu Ha Nguyen, whose telephone number is (703) 305-7447. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 7:30 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, SPE Hosain T. Alam, can be reached at (703) 308-6662.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

The fax number for art unit 2155 is (703) 746-7239.

Thu Ha Nguyen

December 16, 2003


HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER